UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,953	10/30/2006	Kiyoaki Takiguchi	09812.0123	3086
		69/01/2010 FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER EXAMINER		
LLP			EVOY, NICHOLAS LANE	
	K AVENUE, NW N, DC 20001-4413		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
,			3768	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/569,953	TAKIGUCHI, KIYOAKI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
NICHOLAS L. EVOY	3768	

NICHOLAS L. EVOY 3768	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonme application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which pl application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a F for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following timperiods:	laces the Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever i no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WI'MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate exteunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	nsion fee ı; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appear Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS	
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issuence.	es for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-	224)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancer.	•
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanat how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-15.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ion of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be ent because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necess was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to proshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance beca	ause:
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  13. Other:	
/Long V Le/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768 /NICHOLAS L. EVOY/ Examiner, Art Unit 3768	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The addition of the limitation regarding the quasi-electrostatic field detecting means changes the scope of the claim and necessitates further consideration and a new search .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments that Gersheneld fails to teach or suggest that "said quasi-electrostatic field detecting means comprises a first pair of electrodes both formed on a same insulating sheet" is not persuasive. The system disclosed by Gersheneld in Column 8, Lines 42-54 and Figure 10 reads on the newly added claim limitation. Additionally, the amended claims (Claims 1, 8 14 and 15) now include limitations that alter the scope of the claim and present new issues.